

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XIV, Issue No. 1

July 2008

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Are Americans Pro-slavery?

By Walter Williams

Let's do a thought experiment asking whether Americans are for or against slavery. You might say, "What are you talking about, Williams? We fought a war that cost over 600,000 lives to end slavery!" To get started, we might find a description that captures the essence of slavery. A good working description is: slavery is a set of circumstances whereby one person is forcibly used to serve the purposes of another person and has no legal claim to the fruits of his labor.

The average American worker toils from January 1st to the end of April, and has no legal claim to the fruits of his labor for that period. Federal, state and local governments, through the tax code, take what he produces. A small portion of the fruits of his labor is used to provide for the constitutional functions of government. Most of what's taken, up to two-thirds, is given to some other American in the forms of farm and business subsidies, Social Security, Medicare, welfare and hundreds of other government handout programs. As in slavery, one person is being forcibly used to serve the purposes of another person.

You might ask, "Williams, aren't you a bit off base? Slavery means that you are owned by another person." Who owns a person is not nearly important as who has the rights to use that person. In other words, a plantation owner having the power to force a black to work for him would have been just as well off, and possibly better off, not owning him. Not owning him means not having to bear medical expenses and loss of wealth if the slave died. During World War II, Nazis didn't own Jews, but they had the power to force them to labor for them.

Not owning Jews meant that working and starving them to death had little cost to the Nazis. The fact that American slaves were owned, with prices sometimes ranging from \$800 to \$1,300, meant that owners had a financial stake in the slave's well-being and they were not worked and starved to death.

You might argue that my analogy is irrelevant because unlike American slaves and Nazi concentration camp inmates, we can come and go as we please, live where we want, buy a car, clothes and other things with the money left over after the government gets four months' worth of our earnings.

But, does that make much of a difference?

During slavery, visitors to the South often observed "a great many loose negroes about." Officials in Savannah, Mobile and Charleston and other cities complained about "nominal slaves," "virtually free negroes," and "quasi free negroes" who were seemingly oblivious to any law or regulation. Frederick Douglass, a slave, explained this phenomenon when he was employed as a Baltimore ship's caulker: "I was to be allowed all my time; to make bargains for work; to find my own employment, and to collect my own wages; and in return for this liberty, I was ... to pay him (Douglass' master) three dollars at the end of each week, and to board and clothe myself, and buy my own caulking tools."

There are some benefits to being a quasi free person such as Frederick Douglass. There are two ways U.S. Congress might force me to serve the purposes of another American. They might force me spend a couple of hours each day actually working, without compensation, for

another American. Or, they might forcibly take a portion of my earnings so that American can hire someone. I see myself as being better off with Congress doing the latter — taking a portion of my earnings and giving it away.

Some might be put off by my thought experiment and consider it an illegitimate use of the term "slavery." At what point should we consider ourselves a quasi free American — when government takes two-thirds or three-quarters of our earnings?

-- Walter E. Williams is a professor of economics at George Mason University

The State versus the Law

Max Weber defined the "state" in a 1919 lecture in German entitled "Politics as a Vocation" as that which "has a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence." That definition has been highly influential in political science since then, but it is a very European concept, not one that works for the United States or other constitutional republics.

In our tradition, it is not the state but the *law* that authorizes violence, and we the people make the law. Weber used the term "state" to refer collectively to government officials, but in Anglo-American usage the "state" is a people in effective possession of a territory, which may or may not have a government. The primary mechanism for law enforcement is *militia*, not government professionals.

Tyranny can be built on such seemingly subtle distinctions. The Nazi regime was built on the Weber concept.

-- Jon Roland

"The problem with American conservatism"

The problem with American conservatism is that it hates the left more than the state, loves the past more than liberty, feels a greater attachment to nationalism than to the idea of self-determination, believes brute force is the answer to all social problems, and thinks it is better to impose truth rather than risk losing one soul to heresy. It has never understood the idea of freedom as a self-ordering principle of society. It has never seen the state as the enemy of what conservatives purport to favor. It has always looked to presidential power as the saving grace of what is right and true about America.

— Lew Rockwell Jr.

Preparing for the Battle

By Ron Branson, National J.A.I.L. CIC

As has been stated over and over by the judiciary, to include former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, never before has the political system witnessed such "harsh" attacks upon the judiciary as is currently taking place. Such brutality against the judges makes one want to cry.

Now for a little background. Back in 1995 when J.A.I.L. (Judicial Accountability Initiative Law) first began, all political attention was being given only to two branches of government, to wit, the legislature and the executive. No attention was being given to the judges. So J.A.I.L. set out to shine the light of exposure on the judges and successfully brought them to the forefront of publicity. In those days search engines revealed no websites about judges except one set up by the judges themselves complaining that they were being deprived of sufficient salaries to meet the excellent services they were providing the public.

J.A.I.L. sought, and eventually did, change perception so that judicial exposes popped up all over the internet like mushrooms. J.A.I.L. has pumped out an estimated 15 million emails to date constantly exposing and hitting the judges in every way imaginable. We were dedicated to, and focused entirely on exposing the judges and no other cause.

In fact J.A.I.L. has made the words "Judicial Accountability" intensely popular as witnessed by entering those two words into Google. I just did, and it came up with over 63,000 references. These two words, "Judicial Accountability," has become immensely famous.

In that respect J.A.I.L. has accomplished its goal, albeit, that is not the extent of what J.A.I.L. seeks to accomplish. It seeks not only to place those words "judicial accountability" in-your-face of the political establishment, but also to accomplish judicial accountability in reality. J.A.I.L. intends to make corrupt officials hear the repeat of those words "judicial accountability" until they climb into their holes and cover their ears.

Marches are conducted, and demonstrations are held on Capitol Hill all in the name of "judicial accountability." But have you noticed that little to nothing is actually productively forthcoming out of those publicity events. I have come to call these events as the "Meet, Greet, Eat, and Retreat" events, and of course, let us not forget "Repeat!" Hey, we can make it an annual event of meeting in Washington based on these two words, "Judicial Accountability."

Now, former California governors Gray Davis (Democrat) and Pete Wilson (Republican) are scheduled to speak to the state Commission for Impartial Courts which is supposedly studying the political pressures on courts that threaten judges' fairness and impartiality [KCRA.com, July 14, 2008]. What Davis and Wilson will probably say is that this organization known as JAIL4Judges is spreading propaganda about bad judges all over this nation and is making our judges look bad - so very bad, and we must figure some method of plugging this crack in this damn. However, their efforts shall forever prove fruitless, for as long as the judges continue in their manifest arrogance of judicial immunity, they shall forever show their contempt for the law and constitutional principles, forever belching out their judge-made laws from the bench.

Never in a thousand years shall the public find this act tolerable, whether the people perceive they have a remedy or not. As long as judge-made doctrine of judicial immunity continues, I am sure there will be no shortage of ammunition that can and will be fired at the judiciary. But you can count on the fact that no matter how "brutal" the battle against judges gets, they will never willingly give it up. They are as addicted to judicial immunity as a full-blown druggie is to heroin. And so, they shall "forever" complain that we, the public, are placing "improper influence" upon our judges. After all, according to them, we do not want judges to rule

according to the law, but rather according to our political influence.

The height of contradictions I have recently seen is comparing J.A.I.L. with special moneyed interest that wants to interfere with lawful justice in not allowing the judges to rule properly on the cases before them. What they say we want is to interfere with their "judicial independence," and their "impartiality," and give us what we want, even if we have to "put them in jail for decisions we don't like." In other words, the problem in this nation is with us, the People, and not with them, the judges.

To date, not one of our opponents have taken it upon themselves to address the wording of the J.A.I.L. initiative, namely the second paragraph, to wit:

2. Exclusions of immunity. Notwithstanding common law or any other provision to the contrary, no immunities shielding a judge from frivolous and harassing actions shall be construed to extend to any deliberate violation of law, fraud or conspiracy, intentional violation of due process of law, deliberate disregard of material allegations, judicial acts without jurisdiction, blocking of a lawful conclusion of a case, or any deliberate violation of the Constitutions of California or the United States. The foregoing judicial misconduct shall not be construed to mean court decisions made within the authorized capacity of a judge.

Defending Freedom

By Brendan O'Neill

There was a time when Charlton Heston was known as the rugged American who played great historical figures: Moses, Ben-Hur, Michelangelo. He was also a warrior for civil rights and racial equality. There's a snapshot of a dashing Heston picketing a whites-only restaurant in Oklahoma City in 1959, carrying a placard that said: "All men are created equal."

Towards the end of his life, however, he became known as a cranky spokesman for the National Rifle Association, a possibly mad Marlboro Man who said the authorities would have to prize his beloved rifle from his "cold, dead hands". As today's *Independent* points out, younger cinema audiences will most likely know Heston from Michael Moore's *Bowling for Columbine*. The scene in which, in the *Independent's* words, Moore "lured Heston into playing a cameo as a rich, foolish old voice of reaction" still makes for uncomfortable viewing.

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. — Mark Twain

From great actor and progressive campaigner to reactionary old fart who loved guns: everyone agrees it was a tragic fall from grace. But did Heston really make a political u-turn? Actually, no. From the 1950s to the 1990s, he remained rather consistent in his commitment to upholding America's freedoms. It was his liberal critics in the gun control lobby who changed their tune, and made a mad swing from liberalism to authoritarianism.

How gun control came to be seen as a liberal cause is one of life's great mysteries. In both the US and Europe, fully paid-up lefties and progressives will tell you with pride, even pomposity, that the American authorities ought to disarm their populace and ban guns.

What a turnaround. Demanding gun control has traditionally been the preserve of reactionary, even racist U.S. elements. Up until the 1980s, gun control was mostly a conservative campaign, driven by a conviction amongst right-leaning people, that ordinary people, especially those of the non-white variety, could not possibly be trusted with guns. Only the state, they believed, should have the right to use fatal physical force.

The revolutionary government of 1791 made the second amendment to the US constitution, insisting on the right of the citizenry to bear arms as a safeguard against oppressive government. Over the years, various state officials and legislators sought to restrict that right. In its earliest incarnation, gun control legislation was explicitly aimed at disarming black people. Following Nat Turner's rebellion of 1831, when black rebels shot up white slave owners and freed their slaves, a fear of armed blacks led the state of Tennessee to alter its constitution. It changed the guarantee "that the freemen of this state have a right to keep and to bear arms for their common defence", to a guarantee "that the free white men of this state have a right to keep and to bear arms for their common defence".

In 1840, the North Carolina supreme court passed a statute decreeing: "That if any free negro, mulatto, or free person of colour, shall wear or carry about his or her person, or keep in his or her house, any shot gun, musket, rifle, pistol, sword, dagger or bowie-knife ... he or she shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and may be indicted therefore." This law did not apply to whites - only black or mixed-race people.

In the 1890s, Florida also passed race-specific gun control laws. In 1941, Justice Burford, a judge in the supreme court in Florida, overturned a conviction for carrying a handgun without a permit on the basis that the state's original gun control statutes had a racial basis. "I know something of the history of this legislation", he said. "The act was passed for the purpose of disarming the negro labourers ... and to give the white citizens in sparsely settled areas a better feeling of security. The statute was never intended to be applied to the white population and in practice has never been so applied."

At the turn of the 20th century, gun control became a fashionable conservative cause again - in response to immigration from eastern and southern Europe. New local restrictions on gun ownership were passed, such as the 1911 Sullivan law in New York City, in order to prevent the strange newcomers from getting their hands on weaponry. As Gary Kleck points out in his book *Point Blank: Guns and Violence in America*, gun control was anything but a liberal cause back then: "In the 19th and early 20th century, gun control laws were often targeted at blacks in the south and foreign-born in the north."

Throughout the twentieth century, too, gun control tended to rise to the top of the political priority pile when the authorities feared that certain communities were getting out of control. The Gun Control Act of 1968 was ostensibly passed in response to assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, but its real targets were inner-city black communities where there had been violent riots for three summers running, and where some black activists were beginning to arm themselves. That is why the act specifically targeted cheap imported pistols, such as the "Saturday night special"; in other words, the affordable guns of the black ghetto.

In the 1990s, Bill Clinton, recognising that gun control was mutating into a liberal concern, began to talk about assault rifles as the great evil of modern America. Who tended to own assault rifles? "Drug dealers, street gang members and other violent criminals", as the administration put it. These are long-established codewords in polite political circles for blacks and latinos. Whatever you think of the NRA (I am not a fan), it is hard to disagree with their observation that: "The historical purpose of gun control laws in America has been one of discrimination and disenfranchisement of blacks,

immigrants and other minorities." They have also been used to "disarm and facilitate repressive actions against union organisers [and] workers."

There is nothing remotely liberal in demanding that the state should have a monopoly on the use of force over the rest of the population. Liberals have cast off the overtly racial lingo of yesteryear's gun control campaigns - today it is their powerful sense of disconnection from everyday American society that leads them to believe that people with guns are automatically dangerous and demented individuals.

Whatever his motives, whatever underpinned his passion for guns, Charlton Heston, in demanding equal treatment for blacks in the 1950s and later calling for everyone to have the right to bear arms, was a better representative of the spirit of American equality than any of those gun control campaigners who turned him into their favourite redneck whipping boy. You don't have to be a friend of the NRA or a supporter of the senseless shootings in America's poorer communities to oppose gun control. You just have to have some healthy trust in the American people and some healthy distrust of the American state - both qualities that liberals in America and Europe seem to lack today.
-- *Guardian*, April 7, 2008

Exposing "Gun Control" Stupidity

By Scott Miller

As an Instructor at an Alabama State Community College I am acutely aware of the biases against guns and gun ownership. In the wake of recent public shootings in our nation, our institution is considering amending our security policy to better "protect" the faculty, staff and students. Our administration is looking into a number of rather expensive systems to alert personnel to a possible threat on campus.

Although I am not opposed to such systems I realize their limited contribution in defusing a life threatening situation. When I suggested to the administrator in charge of reviewing the institution's security policy that we should consider an appropriate concealed carry policy for faculty and staff as an additional preventative tool I was chided and dismissed as promoting a dangerous/deadly safety policy.

In response to the arrogant dismissal of facts I presented [to] support my suggestion, I took a page

from JPFO and created a handbill of my own. To my surprise some of my fellow instructors wanted a copy. Now the little JPFO inspired handbill is proudly displayed on the office doors of half a dozen instructors at our institution. Under the drawing of a handgun circled and slashed with the red "prohibited" symbol are the words:

Attention Criminals

Gun Free Zone

All law-abiding Faculty, Staff and Students of this Institution have been Disarmed for your Convenience

Alabama State Board of Education Policy 511.01

I have attached a copy of my creation for you. If you are of the mind, you have my permission to post it on your Web site to share with others.

Thanks for your tireless work in protecting all of our rights.

Keep up the good work!
P.S. the reference to the Policy 511.01 at the bottom of the handbill is the Alabama State Board of Education policy that prohibits firearms on community college campuses. Download the Handbill in PDF format - <http://www.jpfo.org/pdf/gunfreezone2.pdf> (1.2Mb) or the smaller image version (will print to 4"x5" size) - <http://www.jpfo.org/images03/handbill-gunfreezone2.jpg> (121k)
-- Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership Alert, March 7, 2008

Forfeiture and Freedom

Representative Bill Sali is introducing a bill to send a message to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE) that freedom still means something in this country.

As part of its Asset Forfeiture training program, the BATFE ordered 2,000 Leatherman tools inscribed with the words "Always Think Forfeiture." The program urges agents to focus on seizing private property.

Rep Sali believes the agency should be thinking 'Freedom,' not 'Forfeiture.' The Idaho Republican received a letter from Acting ATF Director Michael Sullivan, who apologized for the "confusion" over the issue.

While Rep. Sali appreciated the apology, he said that, "My constituents deserve to know the truth about this marketing program, which has been interpreted by many Idahoans as anti-gun and anti-private property."

The agency halted distribution of the tools, but "[t]he fact

remains that the ATF thought it was OK to think 'Always Think Forfeiture' instead of focusing on protecting our constitutional rights," Sali said.

In a letter to his fellow Congressmen, Sali noted that "the inscription raises serious concerns to law-abiding citizens as to the intent of an ATF agent who is performing investigations, particularly with respect to law-abiding gun owners."

Rep. Sali plans to introduce the 'Always Think Freedom' bill sometime next week. The bill will prohibit the agency from making purchases of tool kits "on which any reminder of forfeiture appears."

Action: Please urge your Representative to become an original cosponsor of the "Always Think Freedom Act."

-- Gun Owners of America E-mail alert June 6, 2008

Don't Mess with Miss Tennessee

She's a daddy's girl.

But don't think this year's Miss Tennessee is a pushover.

Ellen Carrington, 21, who was crowned Miss Tennessee on Saturday night, has a concealed weapons permit.

"I have a Smith & Wesson .40-caliber," Carrington told reporters, "(with a) silver top and black body."

A Jackson native and senior at Union University, Carrington decided to get the permit because she was spending a lot of time traveling to and from Nashville at night. She said spending time at shooting ranges with her father, Pat, helped create an even deeper bond between the two.

-- Jackson Sun, June 24, 2008

Paul to host parallel convention

Representative Ron Paul, the Republican presidential candidate, will be the main attraction at the Twin Cities confab September 2. No, not the Republican National Convention nearby, but at his own party, to be held during the convention that will seal Senator John McCain as the GOP nominee.

"This isn't a protest," said Jesse Benton, the libertarian-leaning Republican's spokesman. "This is a celebration of limited government and Republican principles."

Mr. Paul, of Texas, racked up record-breaking amounts of money and passionate Internet support during his bid for the Republican nomination. He refused to quit even after Mr.

McCain amassed enough delegates to claim the nomination, and he continued to garner around a quarter of the votes in late primaries. About 50 people will attend the convention as delegates pledged to Mr. Paul.

But Mr. Paul is unlikely to address the RNC convention, Mr. Benton said. "We haven't officially been turned down," he said, adding that Mr. Paul would certainly speak if asked.

But the fact that Mr. Paul is "unlikely" to endorse Mr. McCain could cause conflict.

"The thing that we want to stress is that this is about being respectful and positive," Mr. Benton said. Still, the separate convention is intended to send the G.O.P. a message about the level of support for Mr. Paul's ideas, and "to completely discount that there might be a little bit of anecdotal evidence that there's going to be friction, that would be naïve."

A contract has been drawn up for the Williams Arena at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis on Sept. 2. The venue could hold more than 14,000 people for the Paul campaign's all-day event. In addition to Mr. Paul, of course, the campaign is looking to book "several high-profile" performers and speakers.

John Mayer, perhaps?

-- New York Times, June 10, 2008

Senators Question Torture Policy

Unsatisfied senators on Tuesday pressed the Bush administration for more answers on its torture policies.

Members of the Judiciary Committee criticized a report from the Department of Justice as vague and incomplete.

Panel members said the document by DOJ Inspector General Glenn Fine and testimony by FBI General Counsel Valerie Caproni did nothing to resolve concerns that U.S. interrogators could still be allowed to torture terror suspects.

The report by Fine had said the FBI "generally avoided" controversial interrogation techniques that military interrogators used. However, the report said that agents only "separated themselves" from the techniques and that the bureau "could have pressed harder its concerns about detainee abuse by other agencies."

The FBI also did not issue written rules on its interrogation policies until after the Abu Ghraib prison abuses became public in 2004, even though a sharp schism had existed

over the issue with the Department of Defense starting in 2002.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), used the report to press her fight to have the CIA adhere to Army Field Manual policies that ban torture. The Senate already unsuccessfully attempted to force such a step earlier this year, but Feinstein vowed that the chamber would insist.

Fine said his investigators found that former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld had personally approved the harshest techniques despite uncertainty over their legality. Democrats pounced on that, too.

"These weren't a few bad apples on the night shift, as we've been told," said Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.).

Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa) suggested Fine's report showed that agents were more concerned with avoiding blame than stopping illegal or immoral practices

Specter told Fine, "You seem to be saying they should be credited for not participating, but it's not sufficient to not participate in these techniques. If they see it, they ought to blow the whistle and do what they can to stop it."

Fine and Caproni also resisted senators' questioning about whether the investigation revealed torture had occurred.

"We didn't do a legal analysis," Fine said.

"Torture has a legal definition, and that's not within my pay grade," said Caproni.

Caproni did say torture is "clearly not permissible in the United States," and repeatedly noted that the FBI has avoided any controversial techniques since mid-2002. She also said the agency strongly prefers rapport-based interrogations, in which an agent will attempt to gain a suspect's confidence over a period of time.

Fine said his investigation found that despite their disagreement with military interrogators over techniques, no FBI agents resigned or threatened to resign from the government.

-- J. Taylor Rushing, *The Hill*, June 10, 2008

Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dummer

This one thing I surely believe: our liberties and freedoms, yea, the Constitution itself, are hanging by the thinnest of threads. Both major

parties have sliced and diced constitutional government to the point that there isn't much left. And the two presumptive candidates for President from the two major parties will only continue to eviscerate what few freedoms and liberties are left.

Both Barack Obama and John McCain will do nothing to secure our borders and ports. Neither will do anything to quench the thirst of our federal government for intrusions abroad and meddling within. Neither will do anything to stop the machinations and lust of the power-elite for globalism and corporatism. They will do nothing to stop the NAFTA superhighway or the burgeoning North American Union. They will do nothing to rid our country of its dependence on foreign oil, and neither will they do anything to stop the infatuation with spending billions and billions of taxpayer dollars on foreign aid.

-- Excerpt from Chuck Baldwin's speech July 15 at the Ron Paul Freedom March in Washington, DC

Barak Obama said his uncle helped to liberate prisoners at Auschwitz. The GOP pounced and the Obama spin machine said it was no biggie.

Both sides are wrong and both miss the point.

Obama apparently mixed up Buchenwald, Germany and Auschwitz, Poland. He's not familiar with the rudimentary facts of World War II.

Barack, the American Army stopped their advance in Germany where they met up with the Soviet Army. Either you didn't know that or you didn't know that Auschwitz is in Poland. Your historical ignorance is astounding for one who seeks to be not only commander in chief but head of a global military empire.

One of the most powerful arguments for a noninterventionist foreign policy is the lack of knowledge and competence of the various presidents and potential presidents to know how other countries should conduct themselves. It's apparent that Obama lacks basic knowledge of recent modern history and basic military history.

John McCain is no better. He claimed that Shiite Iran was training Sunni Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was at war with Shiites in Iraq.

So here we have two men who confidently issue policy prescriptions for far flung nations but who are in fact largely ignorant of the essential facts of modern history.

-- James Ostrowski

Withholding 101

Withholding taxes from people's paychecks began June 9, 1943.

Congress passed it as an emergency measure to get money to fight Hitler. The idea came from Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of Macy's and chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. Called the "pay-as-you-go" tax, so much money came in with so few complaints that it continued after the war.

John F. Kennedy told Congress, April 20, 1961: "Introduced during the war when the income tax was extended to millions of new taxpayers, the wage-withholding system has been one of the most important and successful advances in our tax system in recent times. Initial difficulties were quickly overcome, and the new system helped the taxpayer no less than the tax collector."

But Americans weren't always so taxed.

In his 2nd Annual Message, 1802, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "To proceed as we have begun in substituting economy for taxation."

In his Message to Congress, May 27, 1830, Andrew Jackson said: "Through the favor of an overruling and indulgent Providence our country is blessed with general prosperity and our citizens exempted from the pressure of taxation, which other less favored portions of the human family are obliged to bear."

Senate Moves Forward on Orwellian "Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act"

By Tom Burghardt, May 14, 2008

In the wake of Senators Joseph Lieberman (I-CT) and Susan Collins' (R-ME) alarmist report "Violent Islamist Extremism, the Internet, and the Homegrown Terrorism Threat," the Senate may be moving towards passage of the Orwellian "Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007" (S. 1959).

Under cover of studying "violent radicalization," the bill would broaden the already-fluid definition of "terrorism" to encompass political activity and protest by dissident groups, effectively criminalizing civil disobedience and non-violent direct

action by developing policies for "prevention, disruption and mitigation."

Crafted by former House Intelligence Committee Chairwoman Jane Harman (D-CA), the legislation would create a domestic commission, a university-based "Center of Excellence" that would study and then, target domestic "radicalization" as a "threat" to the "homeland."

David Price, a professor at St. Martin's University who studies state surveillance and the harassment of dissident scholars said that Harman's bill "is a shot over the bow of environmental activists, animal-rights activists, anti-globalization activists and scholars who are working in the Middle East who have views that go against the administration."

Evoking disquieting memories of political witchhunters ensconced in the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the anti-radicalization commission would be empowered to "hold hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties."

According to Jessica Lee of New York's *Independent* newspaper, Harman stated that "the National Commission [will] propose to both Congress and [Department of Homeland Security Secretary Michael] Chertoff initiatives to intercede before radicalized individuals turn violent."

In the context of the post-Constitutional "New Normal" paradigm, Harman and her acolytes evoke images of Philip K. Dick's Department of Precrime in his dystopian novella, *The Minority Report*. Only here, in the bizarre world of outsourced "homeland security," mutant precogs are replaced by high-end--and taxpayer funded--data-miners, psychological profilers and social network analysts in the employ of dodgy security firms linked to America's military-intelligence complex.

The legislation specifically singles out the Internet as a "weapon" for domestic radicalization. When she introduced her bill to the Senate last

November, Harman remarked, "There can be no doubt: the Internet is increasingly being used as a tool to reach and radicalize Americans and legal residents."

Equating America's web-surfacing habits with the threat of ideological infection by Islamist pod-people, Harman avers that the Internet allows Americans "to become indoctrinated by extremists and to learn how to kill their neighbors ... from the comfort of their own living rooms."

(Britney, Paris, better move over... there's a new truck-bombing instructional posted over on YouTube! OMG!)

If the U.S. House and Senate care to examine the "root causes" of terrorism today, they need look no further than the on-going U.S. slaughter in Iraq--a "preemptive" war of choice to which they infamously gave their consent with eyes wide open. -- *Tom Burghardt is a researcher and activist based in the San Francisco Bay Area. In addition to publishing in Covert Action Quarterly, Love & Rage and Antifa Forum, he is the editor of Police State America: U.S. Military "Civil Disturbance" Planning*

Ed.: Anyone want to bet that the militia will not be among the first to be declared a terrorist organization?

"The Fecund and the Confident"

"The future belongs to the fecund and the confident. And the Islamists are both, while the West -- wedded to a multiculturalism that undercuts its own confidence, a welfare state that nudges it toward sloth and self-indulgence, and a childlessness that consigns it to oblivion -- is looking ever more like the ruins of a civilization." -- Mark Steyn, author of *America Alone*

Danger in Our National Parks

Dear GOA Member:

Thanks to your continued efforts and the many thousands of postcards that have landed on the desk

of both the President and Interior Secretary Dick Kempthorne, the Bush administration, after more than seven years, has finally issued regulations permitting the carrying of firearms in National Parks.

There was a time when our National Parks were relatively safe. Sadly, those days are long gone. In the past decade, many of our pristine wilderness, forests and parklands have become primary traffic routes for heavily armed drug smugglers and millions of illegal aliens. Many parks have closed trails and areas that have been used by the drug cartels and coyotes, the two-legged kind that smuggle illegal aliens into the country.

Add to this, the fact that there have been 63 homicides, 240 rapes or attempted rapes, 309 robberies, 37 kidnappings and 1,277 aggravated assaults in recent years and you can see that there is every reason to extend gun rights to our park lands.

This summer you will finally be allowed to carry a firearm into our National Parks, thanks to a new regulation that leaves it to the states in which the Parks are located. [However, that is not enough. We need swift passage of H.R. 5646, which will change the regulation into law.]

Please make a generous contribution to GOA today so we can continue to be your strong voice for gun rights here in Washington.

-- Gun Owners of America, 8001 Forbes Place, Springfield, VA 22151 -- 703-321-8408 -- www.gunowners.org

"God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."—Daniel Webster

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____